

**Certificate of Mailing or Transmission**

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that this correspondence along with other possible documents has been electronically transmitted to the USPTO through its own EFS filing system, on June 28, 2010.

Typed Name: Kevin D. McCarthy  
Date: June 28, 2010

Patent 0-06-165 (16708/US/05)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

OK TO ENTER: N.N./

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir/Madam;

## After-Final Response and Amendment

This response is in reply to the final office action mailed on June 3, 2010.

#### **Amendments**

1. Please amend the claims as shown on the enclosed marked-up pages.  
One amendment defines the upper limit of the nanotubes concentration and therefore addresses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112. The antecedent basis for this amendment was acknowledged by the Examiner at line 1 on page 3 of her last letter.  
The step of stirring has been restricted to the preferred embodiment, by incorporating claim 9 into claim 1, while deleting claim 9.  
Claim 12 has been amended to conform to claim 1.  
No new matter has been entered.

## Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

2. Claims 1, 3-14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being unsupported in the written description due to the missing upper limit for the nanotubes concentration. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended by incorporating the upper limit for the nanotubes concentration, and since this upper limit of 10 wt% is acknowledged by the Examiner (line 1 on page 3 of her letter), the rejection should now be moot.

## Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

3. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Clarke (US 6,878,361). The applicant traverses the rejections, as explained below.

The Examiner wrote at page 3, paragraph 5 in the second final office action, that: